



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Sn  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,792	09/12/2003	Nambi Seshadri	58268.00223	9304
32294	7590	03/28/2005	EXAMINER	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182				LA, ANH V
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2636		

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/660,792	SESHADRI, NAMBI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Anh V La	2636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/12/03</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-21, 23-28, 29-37, 39-44, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumpes (US 6,442,241) in view of Cardina (US 6,411,802).

Regarding claims 1, 17, and 33, Tsumpes discloses a process/system of detecting and communicating alarm events by a security system, the process comprising monitoring sensors 11 in communication with the security system, where specific changes in outputs of the sensors indicate an alarm event, sending data indicating the alarm event over a landline communication medium 14, 17 connecting the security system with a monitoring headquarters 13 and a wireless communication medium 19, 20 to the monitoring headquarters 13 when the alarm event is detected. Tsumpes does not clearly disclose determining whether the landline communication medium is active and sending data over the wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active. Cardina teaches the use of determining whether a landline communication medium is active (502) and sending data over a wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active (504, 508, 510). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include

determining whether the landline communication medium is active and sending data over the wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active to the process of Tsumpes as taught by Cardina for the purpose of providing wireless backup telephone service for landline telephone equipment.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 16, 25, 26, 32, 41, 42, and 48, Tsumpes discloses a process of detecting and communicating alarm events by a security system, the process comprising monitoring sensors 11 in communication with the security system, where specific changes in outputs of the sensors indicate an alarm event, programming a default communication medium, sending data indicating the alarm event over a landline communication medium 14, 17 connecting the security system with a monitoring headquarters 13 and a wireless communication medium 19, 20 to the monitoring headquarters 13 when the alarm event is detected. Tsumpes does not clearly disclose determining whether the landline communication medium is active and switching the default communication medium from the landline communication medium to the wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active. Cardina teaches the use of determining whether a landline communication medium is active (502) and switching a default communication medium from the landline communication medium to a wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active (504, 508, 510). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include determining whether the landline communication

medium is active and switching the default communication medium from the landline communication medium to the wireless communication medium when the landline communication medium is not determined to be active to the process of Tsumpes as taught by Cardina for the purpose of providing wireless backup telephone service for landline telephone equipment.

Regarding claims 2, 18, 27, and 34, Tsumpes discloses querying the sensors 11 to determine baseline output states of the sensors (see figure 1).

Regarding claims 3, 19, and 35, Tsumpes discloses sending data indicating the alarm event over the wireless communication medium 19, 20 comprising establishing a wireless communication connection with the monitoring headquarters and sending data through the wireless communication connection (figures1).

Regarding claims 4, 11, 20, 36, and 43, Tsumpes discloses a telephone line 14, 17.

Regarding claims 5, 12, 21, 28, 37, and 44, Tsumpes as modified by Cardina discloses determining whether the landline communication medium is active comprising detecting whether the telephone line will allow for a connection to be made to a telephone network (Cardina, figures 1, 5).

Regarding claims 7, 14, 23, 30, 39, and 46, Tsumpes discloses a cellular telephone network 19, 20 (figure 1).

Regarding claims 8, 15, 24, 31, 40, and 47, Tsumpes discloses a wireless data service (see fig. 1).

3. Claims 6, 13, 22, 29, 38, and 45, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumpes in view of Cardina as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yao (US 5,983,114).

Regarding claims 6, 13, 22, 29, 38, and 45, Tsumpes in view of Cardina  
discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but still does not disclose a satellite communications link. Yao teaches that it is old and well-known to use a satellite communications link in a wireless communication system (column 1, lines 25-37). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a satellite communications link to the process of Tsumpes (modified by Cardina) as taught by Yao for the purpose of wirelessly communicating between the security system and the headquarters.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brunius, Buhrmann, Britton, Farris, and Chen teach communication systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh V La whose telephone number is (571) 272-2970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**ANH V. LA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Anh V La  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2636

AI  
March 15, 2005